



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/884,549	06/19/2001	Michael J. Lemon	10007916-1	2371
22879 7590 12/15/2008 HEWLETT PACKARD COMPANY P O BOX 272400, 3404 E. HARMONY ROAD INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ADMINISTRATION FORT COLLINS, CO 80527-2400				
EXAMINER KUMAR, SRILAKSHMI K				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2629				
NOTIFICATION DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
12/15/2008		ELECTRONIC		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

JERRY.SHORMA@HP.COM

mkraft@hp.com

ipa.mail@hp.com

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/884,549

Applicant(s)

LEMON, MICHAEL J.

Examiner

SRILAKSHMI K. KUMAR

Art Unit

2629

Period for Reply -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 September 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3, 5-14 and 17-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 5-7 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3, 8-14, 17-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/C)
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____

DETAILED ACTION

The following office action is in response to the amendment filed on September 8, 2008. Claims 1-3, 5-14, 17-20 are pending. Claims 1, 2, 8, 11 and 17 have been amended. Claim 15 is cancelled.

As to independent claim 1, applicant claims "and geometric coordinates of the handwritten mnemonic symbols on the electronic table become indexes of the internet data addresses". The limitation of "the electronic table" does not have antecedent basis. However, Examiner believes that the limitation of "the electronic table" should be --the electronic tablet--; and will be examined as --the electronic tablet--. Appropriate correction is required.

With respect to dependent claim 3, similar to the objection of claim 1, applicant claims "table" which should read --tablet--, as table is not claimed previously. Appropriate correction is required.

Examiner suggests that the applicant check all pending claims to determine if the same error of claiming "table" for --tablet--. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-3, 8-14, 17-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Clary (US Patent No. 7,091,959) in view of Borgström et al (US 6,738,053) and further in view of de Hond (US 6,002,853).

In reference to claim 1, Clary teaches a computer annotator system (Fig. 2) for accessing Internet data addresses (col. 14, lines 55-59, col. 15, lines 25-27 and col. 20, lines 33-37, teaching addresses, email address and web based addresses), the system comprising, an electronic tablet having a screen (Fig. 2, item 280) with plural predefined regions that receive handwritten notations (Fig. 2, item 280, the screen with a preprinted form; Fig. 3, teaches the regions for the handwritten notations) that are hints for different internet data addresses (Fig. 3, shown by the email region); a marking stylus associating the plural predefined regions with the internet data addresses (Fig. 2, item 290, col. 14, lines 11-17). Clary does not teach mnemonic symbols and geometric coordinates of the handwritten mnemonic symbols on the electronic tablet becomes indexes of the internet data addresses. In a similar field of endeavor, Borgström et al teach a system and method for internet data entry and navigation. In Fig. 1, Borgström et al teach an electronic pen (item 10) and a writing tablet (item 12). In Figs. 12, Borgström et al teaches the tablet where the electronic pen is used to hand write information. In col. 6, lines 57-67, Borgström et al teaches accessing a webpage by handwriting mnemonic hints, such as writing YAHOO corresponds to the full URL. Borgström et al teaches using abbreviated hints for different websites. Borgstrom teaches in col. 6, lines 57-67 where the geometric coordinates of the handwritten mnemonic symbols on the electronic table become indexes of the internet data addresses by where based on the hint at it's location, it can be determined the URL or a plurality of URLs associated the hint. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the

time the invention was made to include the feature of using handwritten mnemonic hints for internet addresses as taught by Borgström et al into Clary as the shortcut hints enable quick entry for the user.

Clary does not disclose wherein subsequently accessing one of a predefined regions with said stylus triggers a shift, on a display separate from the tablet, to one of said internet data addresses associated with a handwritten mnemonic hint in the one of the predefined regions. De Hond discloses in col. 2, lines 45-65, wherein electronic forms and documents are provided with hyperlinks, and by clicking or selecting the hyperlinked terms or graphics, you are taken to a webpage. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include hyperlinks as the mnemonic notations of internet data addresses as taught by De Hond into the computer annotator system of Clary as the hyperlinks of de Hond provide relevant information of the data addresses to the user in an expedited way (de Hond, col. 2, lines 45-65).

In reference to claim 2, Borgstrom teaches clicking on the one of the handwritten mnemonic symbols to navigate to the one of the internet data addresses (col. 6, lines 57-67).

In reference to claim 3, Clary teaches that the tablet having at least one predetermined first surface region accessible to stylus wherein annotating function commands are implemented (Fig. 2, item 280 is the tablet where function commands are input) and a predetermined second surface region accessible to stylus wherein freehand symbols indicative of the preselected data address are entered (Fig. 3, where freehand written symbols are entered into the regions).

In reference to claim 6, de Hond teaches continuing said method for a plurality of computer accessible internet sites other than said first and said second as long as there is available space for further handwritten mnemonic symbols (col. 2, lines 45-65).

In reference to claim 7, Clary discloses erasing a said handwritten mnemonic symbol on said writing tablet (col. 9, lines 23-31). Clary in col. 6, lines 16-31, disclose when deleting and editing can be accomplished by the user at any time. De Hond discloses in col. 2, lines 45-65 hyperlinking for the handwritten mnemonic symbol in order to associate the hint with an address indicative of a computer accessible internet site.

In reference to claims 8, 11, and 17, see limitations of claims 1-3, 6 and 7, above

In reference to claim 9, Clary teaches a method of predefining specific locations on said tablet with data indexing functions (Fig. 3).

In reference to claim 10, Clary discloses erasing each said mnemonic object for disassociating a location from the current one of said computer data addresses associated therewith (col. 9, lines 16-31)

In reference to claim 12, Clary teaches that the method provides writing table function keys on said computer writing tablet (Fig. 2).

In reference to claim 13, de Hond teaches defining the screen as a coordinate system with plural locations, each location being a temporary bookmark for an internet site (col. 2, lines 45-65).

In reference to claim 14, de Hond teaches automatically alternating access between a plurality of addresses accessed and associated with mnemonic devices by alternating current selection between said mnemonic devices with a writing tablet writing instrument (col. 2, lines 45-65).

In reference to claim 18, de Hond teaches defining the screen as a coordinate system with plural locations, each location being a temporary bookmark for an internet site (col. 2, lines 45-65).

In reference to claim 19, de Hond teaches that the bookmarks are temporary representation of coordinates on said writing tablet (col. 2, lines 45-65).

In reference to claim 20, de Hond teaches that the bookmarks activates a jump from a current internet site address to an internet site associated with another selected one of said bookmarks (col. 2, lines 45-65).

Allowable Subject Matter

3. Claims 5-7 allowed.
4. The following is an examiner's statement of reasons for allowance:

With respect to independent claim 5, the prior art of record do not teach where the first handwritten mnemonic symbol is being on a first random location on said writing tablet, and where the second mnemonic symbol being on a second random location on said writing tablet.

With respect to dependent claims 6 and 7, these claims are allowed as they depend upon an allowed independent claim.

Any comments considered necessary by applicant must be submitted no later than the payment of the issue fee and, to avoid processing delays, should preferably accompany the issue fee. Such submissions should be clearly labeled "Comments on Statement of Reasons for Allowance."

.Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments filed September 8, 2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

With respect to the 35 USC 101 rejection, as applicant has cancelled claim 15, the rejection is withdrawn.

With respect to claim 1, applicant argues where the prior art of Borgstrom does not teach a handwritten mnemonic symbol. Examiner, respectfully, disagrees. Borgstrom in col. 6, lines 57-67, teaches writing a mnemonic symbol for the different URL addresses. For example, writing YAHOO, will teach the URL address as www.yahoo.com.

Applicant argues where Borgstrom teaches writing a URL in a specific designated area and then touching a connected command to navigate to the URL which is different from the claimed limitation of where accessing one of the handwritten mnemonic symbols with a stylus triggers to the internet address. Examiner, respectfully disagrees. Borgstrom teaches in col. 6, lines 57-67, access to the web and writing an abbreviated URL or symbol in the web access area.

The limitation of "accessing one of the handwritten mnemonic symbols in the predefined regions with said stylus triggers a shift" can be broadly interpreted as the stylus trigger would be the stylus selecting the connect button in order to trigger the internet address. Further the prior art of de Hond teaches where selecting the internet address triggers to the internet address page.

Applicant argues where Borgstrom teaches a specifically formatted piece of paper where only select areas can be written upon. However, applicant claims "a device for associating the handwritten mnemonic symbols on the plural predefined regions". Therefore, by claiming

predefined regions, the prior art of Borgstrom teaches the limitation by the formatted areas of the paper.

With respect to applicant's arguments in regards to claim 5, of where the hints are at random locations of the tablet, the prior art does not suggest this feature, thus as shown above, claim 5 is allowed.

With respect to applicant's arguments in regards to claims 8, 11 and 17, these are similar to the arguments of claim 1, thus applicant is referred to the response of claim 1 above.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to SRILAKSHMI K. KUMAR whose telephone number is (571)272-7769. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:00 am to 4:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Sue Lefkowitz can be reached on 571 272 3638. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Srilakshmi K Kumar/
Examiner
Art Unit 2629

SKK
June 2, 2008